



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,969	05/11/2005	Stefan Nordhoff	5003073.056US1	5585
29737 SMITH MOORE LLP P.O. BOX 21927 GREENSBORO, NC 27420	7590 07/03/2008		EXAMINER ZUCKER, PAUL A	
			ART UNIT 1621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/03/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

phil.mccann@smithmoorelaw.com
lorna.selvaggio@smithmoorelaw.com
mary.garner@smithmoorelaw.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/507,969

Applicant(s)

NORDHOFF ET AL.

Examiner

Paul A. Zucker

Art Unit

1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/1/2008, 4/4/05
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-8 in the reply filed on 4/17/2008 is acknowledged. Claims 9-20 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long. The abstract should consist of a single paragraph of 150 words or less. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 recites the limitation "about 0.55 to about 90" in line 3. No units are provided making it impossible to determine the metes and

bounds of the claimed process. Claim 1 and its dependents are therefore rendered indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pascoe et al (US 4,780,568). Pascoe discloses (Column 1, line 65- column 2, line 4) a process for the purification of methacrylic acid from a mixture with ~ 10% isobutyric acid under substantially anhydrous conditions. The Examiner considers 0.55% water content to correspond to substantially anhydrous methacrylic acid. Pascoe discloses (Column 2, lines 20- 48) a process for the purification of methacrylic acid comprising crystallization of substantially anhydrous methacrylic acid under refrigeration, isolation of said crystals melting a portion of the crystals which are melted and then refluxed in a countercurrent fashion with the remaining crystals to produce purified methacrylic acid. Pascoe discloses (Column 3, lines 53- 66) the production of methacrylic acid containing less than 100 ppm of isobutyric acid. The Examiner presumes that at least some of the crystals formed have the required form since Pascoe's process corresponds to that instantly claimed. Pascoe discloses (Column

2, line 49- column 3, line 15) the separate purification of the mother liquor purified thereby. Pascoe therefore anticipates Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5-8.

6. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eck et al (WO 01/77056-A1 10-2001) as evidenced by Eck et al (US 7,112,695 09-2006). Eck discloses (Column 21, lines 38-65) an acrylic acid purification process in which acrylic acid crystals, formed *in situ*, are contacted in countercurrent fashion with a crude acrylic acid melt. Eck discloses (Column 9, lines 17-24) the use of crude acrylic acid containing 10% water. Eck discloses (Column 11, lines 57-64) successive repetition of the countercurrent washing. Eck discloses (Column 21, lines 19-38) 99.8% pure acrylic acid. The Examiner presumes that at least some of the crystals formed have the required form since Eck's process corresponds to that instantly claimed. Eck therefore anticipates claims 1-8.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982);

In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16 and 19-23 of copending Application No. 10/466,176.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the only difference between the instant claims and those of 10/466,176 is that the instant claims specify the to water content in the purification feed and those of 10/466,176 are silent with regard to water content in the purification feed. Crude acrylic acid, however, often contains water produced in the oxidation process. One of ordinary skill in the art would expect the composition of then purification feed to have a significant impact on the success of any purification procedure and would therefore adjust the water content of the purification feed in the course of optimizing the process. Because of the routine nature of such optimization

there would have been a reasonable expectation for success. Thus the instant claims are obvious over those of 10/466,176.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

8. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-8 are rejected. Claims 9-20 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul A. Zucker whose telephone number is 571-272-0650. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 5:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Evonne Eyler can be reached on 571-272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul A. Zucker/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1621